

REMARKS

The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's careful examination of this case. Reconsideration and re-examination are respectfully requested in view of the instant remarks.

The Applicant agrees with the Office Action Summary as set out on page 1 of the Office Action.

The Applicant was obliged to the Examiner for the detailed explanation of Roddy et al in relation to the Applicant's claims and arguments as set out by the Examiner in paragraphs 1 – 5 on pages 2 – 5 of the Office Action. The Applicant was especially obliged to the Examiner for the Examiner's explanation in paragraph 5 of the Office Action as to why the Applicant's previous arguments were not persuasive. The Applicant notes and agrees with the Examiner's comment at the bottom of page 4 of the Office Action that the Applicant's claim 1 did not specifically disclose a "spatial light modulator".

In the present Amendment, claim 1 has been amended specifically to make it clear that the primary modulator is a primary spatial light modulator, and the auxiliary modulator is a spatial light auxiliary modulator. Claim 1 has been further amended to make it clear that the optical means combines non-modulated light from the second light source with the modulated light from the at least one primary spatial light modulator. Still further, in looking at the end

of claim 1, it was thought that it was perhaps not clear that the auxiliary spatial light modulator modulates the combined light from the optical means, i.e. the combination of the non-modulated light from the second light source and the modulated light from the at least one primary spatial light modulator. It seemed clearest and simplest if the end of claim 1 simply referred to the auxiliary spatial light modulator for modulating the combined light from the optical means.

The Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Roddy et al discloses a system in which each of the light sources is modulated by a modulator, combined in combining means, and further modulated by a common auxiliary modulator. It is also agreed that Roddy et al discloses that the primary modulators may be acousto-optic modulators, which can be spatial light modulators.

However, the Applicant respectfully submits that Roddy et al does not disclose image display apparatus in which light from the first light source is modulated by a first spatial light modulator, the modulated light being combined with non-modulated light from a second light source, and it is this combined light which is then modulated by the auxiliary spatial light modulator. Thus, although Roddy et al discloses a second light source, Roddy et al does not disclose that light from this second light source is non-

modulated light which is combined with the modulated light from the first light source.


For the above reasons, the amended claim 1 is believed to be novel and inventive over Roddy et al.

The Applicant relies for the patentability of the sub-claims 2 - 8 on the fact that these claims include all of the features of claim 1, and claim 1 as currently amended is believed to be allowable for the reasons given above.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

If for any reason this RESPONSE is found to be INCOMPLETE, or if at any time it appears that a TELEPHONE CONFERENCE with Counsel would help advance prosecution, please telephone the undersigned or one of his associates, collect in Waltham, Massachusetts, at (781) 890-5678.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas E. Thompson, Jr.
Reg. No. 47,136